



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,733	02/02/2006	Akira Maenishi	L7002.06101	9734
52989 7590 09/08/2011				
James Edward Ledbetter 1875 Eye Street Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20006				
EXAMINER				
AKRAM, IMRAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1723				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/08/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/566,733	MAENISHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	IMRAN AKRAM	1723	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Imran Akram (3) ____.
- (2) Richard Jordan (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 07 September 2011.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Issues Discussed ☐101 ☐112 ☒102 ☐103 ☐Others
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Komiva (US 2002/0042035 A1).

Substance of Interview

(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

The amendment filed 8/11/11 was discussed. Examiner took the position that two of the features of the claim amendment (the burner and the third tubular wall) do not obviate the anticipation rejection as the Komiva reference discloses a burner (18) and a third tubular wall (14). Komiva may or may not disclose the newly claimed width equalizing means, but the broad wording of the claim language suggests that the element (81) of Komiva may read on those means or that a secondary reference could be combined with Komiva to include this feature, though these points require additional search. Applicant was suggested to more clearly define the structural nature of the wall elements in order to obviate the rejection.

Applicant recodation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

Examiner recodation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recodation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recodation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

/Imran Akram/
Examiner, Art Unit 1723